



From: Zoe Harrison [REDACTED]
Sent: 05 March 2020 17:05
To: James Neave
Cc: Ian Davis
Subject: Application number: WSCC/004/20

EMAIL SENT ON BEHALF OF IAN DAVIS

You can reply directly to this email at [REDACTED]

Dear Mr Neave,

Objection on behalf of Sussex Health Care, owner and operator of Beechcroft Care Centre, West Hoathly Road, East Grinstead.

Beechcroft Care Centre immediately adjoins the application site. It comprises a 30-bed special care home for young adults with profound and multiple disabilities. Sussex Health Care objected to the earlier proposal and our concerns remain.

The proposed development works will have a major impact and cause significant harm to the wellbeing of residents at the site.

This harm will be brought about, primarily, by the scale of the proposed operations and the timescale over which the works will be carried out.

The applicant estimates that the local disruption will occur over an 80 week period, involving the importation and distribution of 150,000 cubic meters of material. The applicant's own estimates equate this to 25,000 HGV movements, 60 lorry movements per day between the hours of 07.00 – 17.00hrs.

The prescribed route of lorry access will take the entirety of traffic along the narrow West Hoathly Lane, directly along the frontage of the Beechcroft Care Centre.

The restoration site lies directly to the south and east of the care centre and the earth moving operations will run along the boundary with bulldozers spreading the impacted material for the entire 80 week period.

The applicant's supporting statement discusses 'surrounding site uses' at paras 2.7/2.8. It fails to identify the special care site at Beechcroft. This is a clear indication that a full appraisal of impact has not been carried out.

One document does identify impacts. The applicant's Noise Impact Assessment predicts that the noise levels at the Beechcroft site will exceed the maximum recommended base level criteria by 13dB. It recognises that mitigation will be necessary.

The mitigation options considered involve:

i) A sound barrier. Due to the contours of the landscape, the applicant has ruled this out as ineffective.

ii) Timing. The applicant suggests that by carrying out operations nearest the boundary during school holidays, this will mitigate the worst impact. Clearly this will not be effective for the Beechcroft site as it is a permanent place of residence for 30 vulnerable young adults. It is not a school.

No other mitigation plans are suggested which means that the Sussex Healthcare site will be subjected to the full impact for the full duration of the operation. The impact, by the applicant's own evidence will severely challenge the living environment of the vulnerable neighbouring residents beyond guidance based upon World Health Organisation recommendations.

The peace and tranquillity of the homes and gardens provided to residents at the Beechcroft site are integral to their wellbeing and quality of life. There are significant and demonstrable impacts as a result of these proposals which have not been properly assessed or mitigated.

The development would introduce an incompatible use into a countryside setting. The cumulative impacts would result in intolerable living conditions. When balanced against the limited benefits of the scheme, there is an significant weight on the side of refusal.

Given the scale of impact it must be concluded that the proposal is not feasible.

Yours sincerely,

IAN DAVIS

ZOE HARRISON

PA TO IAN DAVIS

THE FOUNTAIN HEAD
QUARRY STREET
GUILDFORD SURREY
GU1 3UY

LYTLE-ASSOCIATES.COM